

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 5, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 34 and 54 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 34-59 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 34-49 and 51-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,066, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter “Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,556, issued to Suzuki et al. (hereafter “Suzuki”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Lee nor Suzuki, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee and Suzuki fail to teach a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, the common electrodes “having an obtuse angle at both sides of the common electrodes where each of the common electrodes connects to the common line... wherein liquid crystal molecules in a portion of a domain near the both sides of the common electrodes where each of the common electrodes connects to the common line and the common line between corresponding common electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction as liquid crystal molecules in a remaining portion of the domain”, as recited in independent claim 34 of the present application.

Further, neither Lee nor Suzuki, analyzed alone or in any combination, teach or suggest a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, forming a plurality of common electrodes having “an obtuse angle with the common line at both sides of the common electrodes where each common electrode connects to the common line... wherein the liquid crystal molecules in a portion of the domain near the both sides of the common electrodes where each of the common electrodes connect to the common line and the common line have substantially a same rotational direction as liquid crystal

molecules in a remaining portion of the domain”, as recited in independent claim 53 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Lee fails to disclose “each of the plurality of common electrodes has a substantially sawtooth-shaped base in a region where each of the common electrodes connects to the common line; and wherein liquid crystal molecules in a portion of a domain near the sawtooth-shaped region and the common line between the corresponding electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction as liquid crystal molecules in a remaining portion of the domain” (see, Office Action, page 2). To remedy these deficient teachings of Lee, the Office Action relies upon FIG. 20, ref. R1 of Suzuki. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits Suzuki fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Lee such that any combination of Lee and Suzuki would provide a liquid crystal display device and method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes the combined features recited in the claims of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit Suzuki discloses, in a fifth embodiment, “the lower parallel sides of the common electrode CE are sloped” (col. 8, lines 31-32). However, Suzuki fails to teach the common electrodes “having an obtuse angle with the common line at both sides of the common electrodes where each common electrode connects to the common line”, as recited in independent claim 34, and forming the common electrodes to have “an obtuse angle with the common line at both sides of the common electrodes where each common electrode connects to the common line”, as recited in independent claim 53. Since neither Lee nor Suzuki teach these features of independent claims 34 and 53, independent claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-49 and 51-52, and independent claim 53 and its dependent claims 54-59 are allowable over any combination of Lee and Suzuki. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee and Suzuki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,207, issued to Asada. Applicant respectfully submits no combination of Lee, Suzuki and Asada, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee, Suzuki and Asada fail to teach the common electrodes

“having an obtuse angle with the common line at both sides of the common electrodes where each common electrode connects to the common line”, as recited in independent claim 34 from which claim 50 depends. Because Asada fails to teach at least this feature of claim 34, Asada does not remedy the deficient teachings of Lee and Suzuki discussed above. Accordingly, no combination of Lee, Suzuki and Asada would provide a liquid crystal display device having the combined features recited in independent claim 34. As such, independent claim 34 and its dependent claim 50 are allowable over Lee, Suzuki and Asada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant